

IV—GENERAL ASSEMBLY—IMPORTANT VOTES AND CONSENSUS ACTIONS

Public Law 101-246 calls for analysis and discussion of “votes on issues which directly affected United States interests and on which the United States lobbied extensively.” An important basis for identifying important issues is consistency with the State Department’s Strategic Goals. For the 59th UN General Assembly (UNGA) in 2004, 10 votes and 16 consensus resolutions were identified for inclusion in this section.

Section IV contains five parts: (1) a listing and description of the 10 important votes at the 59th UNGA (nine votes in the Plenary and one in the Third Committee); (2) a listing and description of the 16 important consensus resolutions at the 59th UNGA; (3) voting coincidence percentages with the United States on these important actions that were adopted by votes, arranged both alphabetically by country and in rank order of agreed votes; (4) voting coincidence percentages by UN regional groups and other important groups; and (5) a comparison of voting coincidence percentages on important votes with those on overall votes from Section III. An additional column in the tables of important votes (parts three and four above) presents the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including the 16 important consensus resolutions as additional identical votes. Since not all states are equally active at the United Nations, these coincidence percentages were refined to reflect a country’s rate of participation in all UN voting overall. The participation rate was calculated by dividing the number of Yes-No-Abstain votes cast by a UN member in Plenary (i.e., the number of times it was not absent) by the total number of Plenary votes, plus one vote from the Third Committee (90).

IMPORTANT VOTES

The following 10 important votes are identified by a short title, document number, date of vote, and results (Yes-No-Abstain), with the U.S. vote noted. The first paragraph gives a summary description of the resolution or decision using language from the document (“General Assembly” is the subject of the verbs in the first paragraph), and the subsequent paragraphs provide background, if pertinent, and explain the U.S. position. The resolutions/decisions are listed in order by the date adopted, and then in numerical order.

1. U.S. Embargo Against Cuba

A/Res/59/11

October 28

179-4(US)-1

Calls on all states to refrain from promulgating and applying laws and measures such as the “Helms-Burton Act,” whose extra-territorial consequences allegedly affect the sovereignty of other states and the legitimate

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

interests of entities or persons under their jurisdiction and the freedom of trade and navigation; urges states to repeal such laws.

Background: In 1960, the United States imposed a trade and financial transaction embargo on Cuba because of Castro's repressive policies and expropriation of U.S. property without compensation. The United States strengthened the embargo in 1962, 1992, and 1996. A resolution condemning this embargo has been adopted by the General Assembly since 1992.

U.S. Position: The United States again voted against this resolution, emphasizing the trade embargo is a bilateral issue that is not an appropriate subject for UN consideration. This resolution constituted an attempt by Cuba to divert attention from its government's failings. The measures imposed by the United States do not constitute a blockade, as the embargo does not affect Cuba's trade with other nations. Cuba remains free to trade with any other country in the world, and indeed does so. Moreover, U.S. law permits the sale of food and medicine. Israel, the Marshall Islands, and Palau also voted No; Micronesia abstained.

2. Situation of Human Rights in Sudan

No-action motion November 24 91-74(US)-11

Welcomes the leadership role and the engagement of the African Union in addressing the situation in Darfur. Expresses grave concern at the widespread and grave violations of human rights and international humanitarian law in Darfur and the continuous violations of human rights throughout the Sudan. Calls upon the Government of the Sudan to take all measures necessary to actively promote and protect human rights and international humanitarian law, to immediately take all steps necessary to stop all violence and atrocities, and to end the climate of impunity in Darfur by identifying and bringing to justice all those responsible for the widespread abuses of human rights and violations of international humanitarian law. Urges the Government of the Sudan, the Sudan Liberation Movement, and the Justice and Equality Movement to respect and fully implement in Darfur the ceasefire agreement signed at N'Djamena on April 8, 2004, and calls upon the international community to expand its support for activities aimed at improving respect for human rights and humanitarian law in the Sudan.

Background: The draft resolution's sponsors and cosponsors were deeply concerned about the continuing gross human rights violations committed by the government against the people of Darfur, despite increased international scrutiny. Additionally, the United States remained disappointed by the adoption of a weak Sudan resolution in the Commission on Human Rights in April 2004 and supported a stronger resolution in the Third Committee. It worked closely with the European Union (EU) to support an EU text at least as strong as resolutions considered in the Security Council. South Africa, on behalf of the African group and with the support of the Organization of Islamic Conference, introduced a procedural no-action

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

motion, to block consideration of the resolution in Third Committee. The motion was adopted by a vote of 91-74(US)-11; thus consideration of the draft resolution was ended before a vote on the resolution itself could take place.

U.S. Position: The United States cosponsored this European Union-sponsored resolution and spoke on the floor against the procedural motion. The U.S. Government is deeply disappointed that the Third Committee of the General Assembly passed the no-action motion on this resolution, and on two other resolutions concerning human rights country situations (no-action motions also were passed in November 2004 against resolutions addressing the human rights situations in Belarus and Zimbabwe). The United States is concerned that the UN General Assembly Third Committee dismissed consideration of gross violations of human rights in the Sudan.

3. Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People

A/Res/59/28

December 1

104-7(US)-63

Requests the Committee to continue to exert all efforts to promote the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, to support the Middle East peace process, and to mobilize international support for and assistance to the Palestinian people. Authorizes the Committee to make such adjustments in its approved program of work as it may consider appropriate and necessary in the light of developments and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its 60th session and thereafter.

Background: The General Assembly established the Committee by Resolution 3376 in 1975 and renews its support of the Committee annually.

U.S. Position: The United States believes that the continuation of this Committee that embodies institutional discrimination against Israel is inconsistent with UN support for the efforts of the Quartet to achieve a just and durable solution. (The Quartet is a group comprised of the United States, the United Nations, the European Union, and Russia.) The United States believes this Committee should be abolished and actively lobbies other countries to withdraw their support for the annual resolution renewing the Committee's mandate.

4. Division for Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat

A/Res/59/29

December 1

103-8(US)-64

Requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Division with the necessary resources and to ensure that it continues to carry out its program of work as detailed in relevant earlier resolutions, in consultation with the committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and under its guidance. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure the continued cooperation of the Department of Public Information and other units of the Secretariat in enabling the Division to perform its tasks. Also requests

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

the Committee on Palestinian Rights and the Division to continue to organize an annual exhibit on Palestinian rights or a cultural event, in observance of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People.

Background: The General Assembly established the Division for Palestinian Rights by Resolution 32/40 in 1977.

U.S. Position: The United States believes that the continuation of the division, which embodies institutional discrimination against Israel, is inconsistent with UN support for the efforts of the Quartet to achieve a just and durable solution. The United States believes this division should be abolished and actively lobbies other countries to withdraw their support for the annual resolution renewing the division's mandate.

5. Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMCT)

A/Res/59/81

December 3

179-2(US)-2

Recalls the decision of the Conference on Disarmament to establish an *ad hoc* committee which shall negotiate a non-discriminatory, multilateral, and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. Urges the Conference on Disarmament to agree on a program of work that includes the immediate commencement of negotiations on such a treaty.

Background: Since 1999, the Conference on Disarmament (CD) has been unable to establish an *ad hoc* committee to negotiate an FMCT. This 65-nation body operates by consensus, and competing priorities among the political groups therein have resulted in a failure by the CD to adopt a program of work over the past eight years. As the result of an internal policy review, the United States in July 2004 reaffirmed at the CD its continued support for the negotiation of an FMCT. The United States at that time also announced its concern that such a treaty could not be effectively verified.

U.S. Position: The text of the resolution, which is a decade or more old, calls for the negotiation of an “internationally and effectively verifiable treaty.” Since the United States no longer believes that an FMCT can be effectively verified, the United States voted against this resolution both in the First Committee, where the United States delivered an Explanation of Vote laying out its position, and in the Plenary.

6. Work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories

A/Res/59/121

December 10

84-9(US)-80

Commends the efforts of the Special Committee in performing the tasks assigned to it by the General Assembly. Deplores those policies and practices of Israel that violate the human rights of the Palestinian people and

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

other Arabs of the occupied territories, expresses grave concern about the situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and requests the Special Committee to continue to investigate Israeli policies and practices. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Special Committee with all necessary facilities and to continue to make available such staff as may be necessary so that the Special Committee may continue its work.

Background: The General Assembly established the Special Committee by Resolution 2443 in 1968.

U.S. Position: The United States believes that the continuation of this Committee that embodies institutional discrimination against Israel is inconsistent with UN support for the efforts of the Quartet to achieve a just and durable solution. The United States believes this Committee should be abolished and actively lobbies other countries to withdraw their support for the annual resolution that renews the Committee's mandate.

7. Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance

A/Res/59/199

December 20 186(US)-0-0

Reaffirms that freedom of thought, conscience, religion, or belief is a human right derived from the inherent dignity of the human person and guaranteed to all without discrimination. Urges states to ensure that no one within their jurisdiction is, because of their religion or belief, deprived of the right to life, liberty, and security of person; the right to freedom of expression; the right not to be subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, and the right not to be arbitrarily arrested or detained; and to protect their physical integrity and bring to justice all perpetrators of violations of these rights.

Urges states to devote particular attention to combating all practices motivated by religion or belief which lead, directly or indirectly, to human rights violations and to discrimination against women. Recognizes that legislation alone is not enough to prevent violations of human rights, including the right to freedom of religion or belief, and that the exercise of tolerance and nondiscrimination by persons and groups is necessary for the full realization of the aims of the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief, and in this regard invites states, religious bodies, and civil society to undertake dialog at all levels to promote greater tolerance, respect, and understanding of freedom of religion or belief and to encourage and promote, through the educational system and by other means, understanding, tolerance, and respect in matters relating to freedom of religion or belief.

Recognizes with deep concern the overall rise in instances of intolerance and violence directed against members of many religious communities in various parts of the world, including cases motivated by Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, and Christianophobia.

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

Urges states to exert their utmost efforts, in accordance with their national legislation and in conformity with international human rights standards, to ensure that religious places, sites, and shrines are fully respected and protected, and to take additional measures in cases where they are vulnerable to desecration or destruction.

Background: The General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief in 1981, which spelled out the UN Charter provision to promote and encourage universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to religion. The General Assembly has been adopting this resolution every year since 1981; for the first time, it has references to Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, and Christianophobia.

U.S. Position: Religious freedom is a principal cornerstone for the United States. Immigrants settled in the United States seeking freedom from religious discrimination; freedom to practice religion is the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The United States believes that laws prohibiting religious discrimination reduce or eliminate other fears which divide people along ethnic, racial, and national lines. One of the U.S. goals at this year's General Assembly was for the Assembly to adopt a resolution which addressed the problem of anti-Semitism. The United States was one of more than 50 cosponsors of this resolution.

8. Enhancing the Role of Regional, Subregional, and Other Organizations and Arrangements in Promoting and Consolidating Democracy

A/Res/59/201

December 20

172(US)-0-15

Declares that the essential elements of democracy include respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of association and assembly, the freedom of expression, the right to take part in the conduct of public affairs, the right to vote in genuine periodic free elections by universal and equal suffrage, as well as a pluralistic system of political parties and organizations, respect for the rule of law, the separation of powers, transparency and accountability in public administration, and a free, independent, and pluralistic media.

Acknowledges that democracy contributes to the realization of all human rights, and that democracy contributes substantially to preventing violent conflict, and to accelerating reconciliation and reconstruction in post-conflict peace-building. Reaffirms that the promotion and protection of all human rights is a basic prerequisite for the existence of a democratic society.

Recognizes the importance of actions taken at the regional and subregional levels aimed at developing and consolidating democratic institutions. Invites intergovernmental, regional, sub-regional, and other

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

organizations, as well as relevant nongovernmental organizations, to work towards the promotion and consolidation of democracy by identifying and disseminating best practices and experiences in promoting and protecting democratic processes; establishing and supporting civic education programs that provide access to information on democratic governance; encouraging the study of democracy, human rights, and good governance in schools and universities; and working with the Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights (OHCHR) focal point for democracy.

Welcomes the adoption by various organizations of institutional rules designed to prevent situations that threaten democratic institutions. Encourages member states and intergovernmental, regional, and cross-regional organizations to initiate networks and partnerships with a view to assisting the governments and civil society in their respective regions in disseminating knowledge and information about the role of democratic institutions and mechanisms in meeting the political, economic, social, and cultural challenges in their respective societies. Invites the UN system to identify, develop, and coordinate effective policies of assistance in the field of democracy, and to support programs of technical assistance to states, upon their request, aimed at developing an independent judiciary, strengthening political party systems and independent media, and fostering a democratic culture.

Finally, calls upon the OHCHR to stimulate dialogue and interaction within the United Nations and between the United Nations and interested organizations on the ways and means of promoting democratic values and principles.

Background: Several members of the UN democracy caucus put this resolution forward, and many of these delegations cosponsored the resolution. It followed up on a 2004 resolution at the 60th session of the Commission on Human Rights establishing a “focal point” for democracy in the OHCHR which was co-tabled by the United States, East Timor, Peru, and Romania for the democracy caucus.

U.S. Position: The United States supported and cosponsored this resolution because of its commitment to strengthening and spreading democracy throughout the world. The United States believes that increasing the number of democracies worldwide and strengthening fragile democracies will promote the observance of internationally accepted human rights standards and democratic principles and send strong signals to those who violate these standards.

9. Situation of Human Rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

A/Res/59/205

December 20 71(US)-54-55

Expresses its serious concern at the continuing violations of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran; the worsening situation with regard to freedom of opinion and expression and freedom of the media, including

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

arbitrary arrest and detention without charge or trial; the disqualifications of prospective candidates in the Majlis elections and the intimidation of opposition activists before the February 2004 elections; the continuing executions in the absence of respect for internationally recognized safeguards, and in particular deplores the execution of persons below 18 years of age, contrary to Iran's obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as well as public executions; the use of torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman, and degrading punishment; the continued restrictions on free assembly and forcible dissolution of political parties; the systemic discrimination against women and girls in law and in practice; the continuing discrimination against persons belonging to minorities, including Christians, Jews, and Sunnis, and the increased discrimination against the Baha'is; the continuing persecution of human rights defenders, political opponents, religious dissenters, and reformists.

Calls upon the Government of Iran to abide by its obligations freely undertaken under the International Covenants on Human Right and other international human rights instruments; to implement fully the ban on torture, announced in April 2004 by the head of the judiciary, and the related parliamentary legislation of May 2004; to expedite judicial reform, to guarantee the dignity of the individual and to ensure the full application of due process of law and fair and transparent procedures by an independent and impartial judiciary, and in this context to ensure respect for the rights of the defense and the equity of verdicts in all instances, including for members of religious minority groups, officially recognized or otherwise; to eliminate all forms of discrimination based on religious grounds or against persons belonging to minorities, including the Baha'is, Christians, Jews, and Sunnis, and to address this matter in an open manner, with the full participation of the minorities themselves, and to ensure respect for the freedom of religion or belief of all persons; to end amputation and flogging and all other forms of punishment that are cruel, inhuman, or degrading; and to abolish the punishment of execution by stoning and, in the meantime, to end the practice of stoning as recommended by the head of the judiciary.

Background: The Government of Iraq disqualified large numbers of prospective candidates from the February 2004 parliamentary elections. The government also continued its practices of summary executions in absence of internationally recognized safeguards; use of torture; discriminatory treatment towards women and girls; and persecution of minorities, journalists, students, academics, and clerics.

U.S. Position: The United States cosponsored this Canadian-sponsored resolution and lobbied other delegations to vote in favor of the text. The United States believes that this resolution demonstrated the international community's concern over the human rights situation in Iran and the desire to hold the government accountable for its human rights abuses.

10. International Trade and Development

A/Res/59/221

December 22 166-2(US)-6

Recognizes that a universal multilateral trading system can substantially stimulate development worldwide, benefiting countries at all stages of development, thereby promoting economic growth and sustainable development that is necessary to achieve the internationally agreed development goals. Reaffirms the value of multilateralism to the global trading system while ensuring balance and parallel progress within and between areas under negotiation, bearing in mind the needs and concerns of developing countries. Emphasizes that bilateral trade arrangements should complement the goals of the multilateral trading system and expresses its concern about the adoption of a number of unilateral actions that are not consistent with the rules of the World Trade Organization (WTO). Invites the UN Conference on Trade and Development to monitor and assess the evolution of the international trading system.

Background: Debated heavily in the Second Committee, this proposal from the Group of 77 and China deals with, among others, the topics of how to increase coherence between the external economic environment and national efforts, and in that context how to ensure that the monetary and financial system, as well as the trade system, reinforce rather than undermine each other.

U.S. Position: The United States voted against this resolution. Although the United States endorses many of the principles enunciated in the resolution and remains fully committed to the Doha Development Agenda (2001), it strongly believes that the United Nations should not pronounce on issues under negotiation in the WTO. The United States believes that the declarations and decisions of the WTO are carefully balanced compromises and efforts by outside parties to distort those decisions or to prejudice issues under negotiation in the WTO can only hamper the current negotiations.

IMPORTANT CONSENSUS ACTIONS

The 16 important consensus resolutions are listed and described below. For each resolution, the listing provides a short title, the document number, and date adopted. The first paragraph gives the summary description of the resolution, using language from the resolution (“General Assembly” is the subject of the verbs). Subsequent paragraphs provide background and explain the U.S. position. The resolutions are listed in order by date and then in numerical order.

1. International Convention Against the Reproductive Cloning of Human Beings

Proposal adopted November 19

Background: The Sixth (Legal) Committee considered two draft resolutions concerning a possible international convention against human cloning. Costa Rica introduced a resolution, which the United States cosponsored, that called for negotiation of a convention to ban all forms of human cloning. Belgium introduced a draft resolution that sought to ban reproductive cloning only, which would have left the door open for states to allow so-called “research,” “therapeutic,” or “experimental” cloning. In the final days of negotiation, Italy introduced a draft Declaration that urged all member states to prohibit any attempts to create human life through the process of cloning. In an effort to build an international consensus, the Sixth Committee agreed by consensus to form a Working Group to meet in February 2005 using the Italian proposal as the basis for its work.

U.S. Position: The United States has consistently held the position that all human cloning—for reproduction and research alike—should be banned. The United States supported the Costa Rican proposal to negotiate a convention banning all human cloning. When this proposal was withdrawn, the United States joined consensus to form the Working Group to draft a Declaration urging all member states to prohibit cloning. The U.S. goal is a strong UN statement that all human cloning should be prohibited. The formation of a Working Group will provide further opportunity for the United Nations to agree on this position.

2. International Criminal Court

A/Res/59/43 December 2

Calls upon all states that are not yet parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC) to consider ratifying or acceding to it without delay, and encourages efforts aimed at promoting awareness of the results of the UN Diplomatic Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Establishment of an International Court, held in Rome from June 15–July 17, 1998. Calls upon all states to consider becoming parties on the Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the International Criminal Court without delay.

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

Welcomes the holding of the third session of the Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute in The Hague from September 6–10, 2004; also welcomes the election of the new President of the Assembly of States Parties, new members to the Committee on Budget and Finance, and the second Deputy-Prosecutor, and the Assembly of States Parties' adoption of a number of decisions and resolutions. Recalls the Assembly of States Parties' establishment of a Special Working Group on the Crime of Aggression, open to all states on an equal footing.

Recalls that pursuant to the Relationship Agreement, the ICC may attend and participate in work of the General Assembly in the capacity of observer, and also that the Court may submit reports on its activities to the 59th and following sessions of the General Assembly.

Background: Following the General Assembly's adoption of this resolution, the United States made a short statement disassociating itself from consensus and the Netherlands made a longer statement on behalf of the European Union.

U.S. Position: The United States dissociated itself from consensus on this resolution in light of its long-standing concerns about the ICC. These concerns include the ICC's claimed authority to investigate and prosecute persons who are nationals of countries that are not parties to the Rome Statute, including U.S. citizens, and the lack of provision in the Rome Statute for UN Security Council oversight of the ICC's activities.

3. Bilateral Strategic Nuclear Arms Reductions and the New Strategic Framework

A/Res/59/94

December 3

Welcomes the entry into force of the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions (the Moscow Treaty) on June 1, 2003, under which the United States and Russia are committed to reducing and limiting their strategic nuclear warheads so that by December 31, 2012, the aggregate number of such warheads does not exceed 1,700 to 2,200 for each party. Recognizes that the Moscow Treaty is an important result of the new bilateral strategic relationship, which will help establish more favorable conditions for actively promoting security and cooperation, and enhancing international stability.

Supports the continued commitment of the United States and Russia to cooperative efforts in strategic offensive reductions. Acknowledges the contribution that the United States and Russia have made to nuclear disarmament by reducing their deployed strategic warheads by about half since the end of the cold war.

Recognizes the importance of the Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START), which is still in force, and of its provisions, which will lay the foundation for ensuring confidence,

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

transparency, and predictability in further reductions. Also recognizes that, since the end of the cold war, the United States has reduced the number of START-accountable deployed strategic warheads from over 10,000 to less than 6,000, and has also eliminated 1,032 launchers for intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-launched ballistic missiles, 350 heavy bombers, and 28 ballistic missile submarines, and removed four additional ballistic missile submarines from strategic service. Further recognizes that, in the same time period, Russia has reduced the number of START-accountable deployed strategic warheads to less than 5,000, and has also eliminated 1,250 launchers for intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-launched ballistic missiles, 43 ballistic missile submarines, and 65 heavy bombers.

Notes with approval that, since the end of the cold war, the United States and Russia have halted the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and have committed themselves to eliminating excess fissile material resulting from the dismantlement of weapons no longer needed for national security. Also welcomes the independent action taken by the United States to dispose of 174 metric tons of excess highly enriched uranium from its nuclear weapons program, of which 50 metric tons have already been downblended for use as reactor fuel. Supports continued efforts by the United States and Russia to implement the 1997 Agreement concerning Cooperation regarding Plutonium Production Reactors and the 2000 Agreement concerning the Management and Disposition of Plutonium Designated as No Longer Required for Defense Purposes and Related Cooperation.

Background: The United States and Russia signed a treaty on strategic offensive reductions and issued a joint declaration on the new strategic relationship between Russia and the United States on May 24, 2002. The treaty entered into force on June 1, 2003.

U.S. Position: The United States recognized that new global challenges required a new foundation for strategic relations with Russia based on mutual security, trust, openness, cooperation, and predictability. The mutual determination of Russia and the United States to work towards these goals deserve the endorsement of the world community.

4. Improving the Effectiveness of the Methods of Work of the First Committee

A/Res/59/95

December 3

Invites member states to consider the biennialization or triennialization of the agenda items discussed in the First Committee, on a voluntary basis, and particularly when no specific action is required for the implementation of relevant resolutions. Further invites member states to submit draft resolutions in a more concise, focused, and action-oriented manner and, where practical, to consider the possibility of submitting draft decisions.

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

Reiterates that the Secretary-General shall keep all committees, including the First Committee, informed of the detailed estimated cost of all resolutions and decisions that have been recommended by the committees for approval by the Assembly. Requests the First Committee, in the light of the growing interconnectedness of issues before the General Assembly, to explore the forms of mutual cooperation with other main committees.

Background: This resolution follows up on the U.S. Improvement Initiative in the 2003 First Committee. In 2004, the United States submitted a draft resolution in the First Committee that merged with a competing draft resolution on reform from the Non-Aligned Movement after extensive negotiations. The resulting joint measure was approved by consensus. On a separate track, and in accordance with Resolution 58/316, efforts related to this resolution resulted in the First Committee Chair (Mexico) forwarding consensus recommendations to the General Assembly's General Committee on reorganizing the First Committee's agenda.

U.S. Position: This resolution preserved all key U.S. recommendations, including a call on the Secretariat to improve its processing of Program Budget Implications statements so that member states would receive timely notification of financial implications of resolutions. This initiative, originated by the United States, obtained 104 other sponsors in the First Committee.

5. Celebrating the Tenth Anniversary of the International Year of the Family

A/Res/59/111

December 6

Recalls Resolution 44/82 and welcomes the celebration of the 10th anniversary of the International Year of the Family on December 6, 2004, at UN Headquarters. Encourages governments to integrate a family perspective in the planning process.

Background: Resolution 44/82 of December 8, 1989, proclaimed 1994 the International Year of the Family as a measure to promote social progress and better standards of life through the stability and well-being of the family. The resolution encouraged UN agencies and intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations to work closely with the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the Secretariat on family-related issues.

U.S. Position: The United States joined consensus on this resolution as it believes that governments ought to honor and support the family as the most critical structure for ensuring the well-being of children. Primarily the United States believes that the governments should work to support and strengthen families by respecting the prerogatives of families, encouraging healthy marriages, and supporting all families that need assistance.

6. Providing Support to the Government of Afghanistan in Its Efforts to Eliminate Illicit Opium and Foster Stability and Security in the Region

A/Res/59/161

December 20

Recalls the UN Millennium Declaration and interrelated commitments to eliminate illicit opium, including Security Council Resolution 58/141 (2003) that recommended adequate help be provided to Afghanistan in support of the Transitional Administration of Afghanistan's commitment to eliminate illicit opium. Reaffirms commitments undertaken by member states that action against the world drug problem was a common and shared responsibility and that it must be addressed in a multilateral setting. Recalls the Joint Ministerial Statement from the 20th special session of the General Assembly that the United Nations and other multilateral forums should help in the provision of alternative livelihoods within Afghanistan and in the neighboring states and countries along trafficking routes, and that extensive efforts also needed to be made to reduce the global demand for illicit narcotics.

Calls upon the international community to enhance financial and technical support to Afghanistan to implement its national drug control strategy; urges stakeholders to accelerate efforts to implement a combined strategy of eradication, interdiction, demand reduction, awareness building, and provision of alternative, sustainable livelihoods; and encourages the Government of Afghanistan to accelerate implementation of the commitments it made in the five action plans adopted by the International Counter-narcotics Conference on Afghanistan of February 8 and 9, 2004. Reaffirms the need to strengthen global demand reduction, and requests the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), subject to the availability of voluntary funds and with assistance from other international organizations and financial institutions, to assist the Government of Afghanistan so that sustainable alternative livelihoods are created in Afghanistan.

Background: In addition to the United States, other member states, principally European countries in the Group of Eight, have contributed substantial sums to fighting opium cultivation and trafficking in/from Afghanistan. In addition, a number of European countries contributed to the UNODC for ongoing counter-narcotics projects in Afghanistan. Projects funded include alternative development, monitoring of opium production, drug demand reduction, interdiction, border security, and counter-narcotics enforcement.

U.S. Position: Afghanistan remains the most serious, intractable problem facing the United States in counter-narcotics. The United States remains committed to working with the newly elected Government of Afghanistan and its neighbors to fight the trafficking in narcotics and to assist Afghan opium producers to find alternative livelihoods. The United States joined consensus in adopting this resolution.

7. Trafficking in Women and Girls

A/Res/59/166

December 20

Urges governments to take appropriate measures to address the root and external factors that encourage the trafficking of women and girls for prostitution and other forms of commercialized sex, forced marriage, and forced labor; and to devise, enforce, and strengthen effective measures to combat and eliminate all forms of trafficking in women and girls. Calls upon governments to criminalize all forms of trafficking in persons, to take appropriate measures to raise public awareness of the issue, particularly the trafficking of women and girls, including the demand side of the problem, and to provide or strengthen training for law enforcement, judicial, immigration, and other relevant officials in the prevention and combating of trafficking in persons. Further urges governments to strengthen national programs to combat trafficking through increased bilateral, regional, and international cooperation and to consider signing and ratifying relevant international instruments. Welcomes the appointment of the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights on trafficking in Persons, especially women and children.

Background: The Philippines has introduced resolutions on trafficking for a number of years. The Philippines is also the main sponsor of a similar resolution adopted by the UN Commission on Human Rights.

U.S. Position: During negotiations, the United States supported the addition of references addressing sex tourism and sexual exploitation to the Philippines' draft resolution. The United States joined consensus on this resolution, but did not cosponsor because of a paragraph concerning the International Criminal Court.

8. Assistance to Refugees, Returnees, and Displaced Persons in Africa

A/Res/59/172

December 20

Notes the need for African states to address the root causes of forced displacement in Africa and to foster peace, stability, and prosperity so as to forestall refugee flows. Recognizes that women and children are the majority of the population affected by conflict and bear the brunt of atrocities and other consequences of conflict. Reiterates the importance of better addressing the specific protection needs of refugee children and adolescents, in particular, the need to ensure attention to unaccompanied children and former child soldiers in refugee settings as well as in voluntary repatriation and reintegration measures.

Notes with great concern that, despite all efforts made by the United Nations, the African Union, and others, the situation of refugees and other displaced persons in Africa remains precarious, and calls upon states and other

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

parties to armed conflict to observe scrupulously international and humanitarian laws. Reaffirms that host states have the primary responsibility to ensure the civilian and humanitarian character of asylum, and calls upon states to take all necessary measures to ensure respect for the principles of refugee protection and, in particular, to ensure that refugee camps are not compromised by the presence or activities of armed elements or used for purposes incompatible with their civilian character. Recognizes the need to strengthen the capacity of states to provide assistance and protection to refugees, returnees, and displaced persons, and calls upon the international community to increase its assistance in this regard.

Condemns all acts that pose a threat to the security and well-being of refugees and asylum seekers. Deplores the deaths, injuries, and other violence sustained by staff members of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees and other humanitarian organizations, and urges states and other parties to conflict to take all measures to prevent attacks on and kidnapping of national and international humanitarian workers.

Reaffirms the right of return and the principle of voluntary repatriation. Notes with satisfaction the voluntary return of thousands of refugees to their countries of origin. Reaffirms that voluntary repatriation should not necessarily be conditioned on the accomplishment of political solutions in the country of origin in order not to impede refugees' right of return. Recognizes that repatriation and reintegration is normally guided by the conditions in the country of origin, in particular that voluntary repatriation can be accomplished with safety and dignity.

Appeals to the international community to respond positively to resettlement needs of African refugees and urges support for the refugee programs of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees. Calls upon international donors to provide financial and material assistance for community-based development programs intended for the rehabilitation of the environment and infrastructure affected by refugees in countries of asylum. Requests the Secretary-General to submit a comprehensive report on assistance to refugees, returnees, and displaced persons in Africa at its 60th session.

Background: This was a resolution led by South Africa and negotiated largely among African states themselves, though cosponsored by several Western countries as well. It drew primarily from the UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) Executive Committee Conclusions made earlier in 2004.

U.S. Position: The United States joined consensus on this resolution, which called upon the international community to respond positively to appeals for assistance to UNHCR for its programs assisting African refugees, returnees, and displaced persons, and which reiterated that each host country is primarily responsible for the security and protection of refugees in their respective territories.

9. Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

A/Res/59/182

December 20

Condemns all forms of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, including through intimidation, which are and shall remain prohibited at any time and in any place whatsoever and can thus never be justified. Calls upon all governments to implement fully the prohibition on torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment. Urges governments to take effective measures to prevent torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, including their gender-based manifestations.

Condemns any action or attempt by states or public officials to legalize or authorize torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment under any circumstances, including on grounds of national security or through judicial decisions, and calls upon governments to eliminate any practices of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment. Stresses that all acts of torture must be made offences under domestic criminal law, and emphasizes that acts of torture are serious violations of international humanitarian law and can constitute crimes against humanity and war crimes, and that the perpetrators of all acts of torture must be prosecuted and punished.

Recalls that states shall not expel, return, or extradite a person to another state where there are substantial grounds for believing that the person would be in danger of being subjected to torture. Calls upon all governments to cooperate with and assist the Special Rapporteur on the torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment in the performance of his task.

Background: The Convention against Torture established the Committee Against Torture, which, among other things, is charged with reviewing periodic reports submitted by the States Parties to the Convention. The UN Special Rapporteur on torture, who regularly undertakes fact-finding country visits, is strongly supported by the United States.

U.S. Position: The United States unequivocally condemns the practice of torture and is a party to the Convention against Torture. The United States cosponsored this resolution with many other countries.

10. Report of the Committee for Development Policy on Its Sixth Session (graduating countries from least developed country status)

A/Res/59/210

December 20

Recalling Economic and Social Council Resolution 2004/67, on the report of the Committee for Development Policy and taking into account its resolution 59/209 of December 20 on a smooth transition strategy for countries graduating from the group of least developed countries (LDCs), takes note of the recommendations of the Committee for Development Policy to graduate Cape Verde and Maldives from the group of least developed countries.

Background: The resolution on Smooth Transition Strategy for Countries Graduating From the List of Least Developed Countries outlines steps for the smooth transition of states graduating from least developed country status. It is a companion to this resolution which graduates the Maldives and Cape Verde from LDC status. The Secretary-General is requested to assist countries graduating from the list by providing a consultative mechanism to help forge a transition strategy. Development and trading partners are asked to consider extending to the graduating country trade preferences previously made available as a result of least developed country status. The UN's Committee for Development Policy is also asked to monitor the progress of the graduating country as a complement to its triennial review of the list of least developed countries and to report on that progress to the Economic and Social Council.

U.S. Position: The United States joined other council members in consensus to adopt and support this resolution.

11. Follow-Up to and Implementation of the Outcome of the International Conference on Financing for Development

A/Res/59/225

December 22

Notes international efforts, contributions, and discussions aimed at identifying possible innovative and additional sources of financing for development from all sources, public and private, domestic and external, within the follow-up to the International Conference on Financing for Development, recognizing that some of such sources and their use fall within the realm of sovereign action.

Underlines the importance of implementing sound policies, good governance, and the rule of law; mobilizing domestic resources; and coherent and consistent international monetary, financial, and trading systems. Recognizes the issues of concern to developing countries acknowledged in the Monterrey Consensus and the importance that a rule-based, open, and equitable multilateral trading system, as well as meaningful trade liberalization, can play in stimulating economic growth and development.

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

Acknowledges the role that the private sector can play in generating new financing for development and stresses the importance of pursuing policy and regulatory frameworks to foster a dynamic and well-functioning business sector to increase economic growth and reduce poverty.

Calls on developed countries to devise measures to encourage the flow of foreign direct investment and calls upon developing countries to create a conducive environment for attracting investments. Recalls the commitments made at the International Conference on Financing for Development to increase the levels and effectiveness of official development assistance and urges developed countries to make efforts towards the target of 0.7 percent of gross national product, and encourages developing countries to continue to work to ensure that assistance is used effectively. Stresses that debt relief can play a key role in liberating resources for activities consistent with poverty eradication, achieving economic growth and sustainable development, and internationally agreed development goals, and notes with concern that some countries have not achieved lasting debt sustainability. Stresses the importance of advancing in efforts to reform the international financial architecture as envisaged in the Monterrey Consensus. Emphasizes that corruption at all levels is a serious barrier to development.

Background: The International Conference on Financing for Development held in March 2002 broke new ground as a UN development conference. The final Consensus document stressed good governance and the need to mobilize private resources, both domestic and international, in order to achieve economic growth and development. Participants agreed that sustained follow-up within the UN system, including collaboration among the Bretton Woods institutions, World Trade Organization, and UN bodies, would underscore the importance of implementing proven success strategies as agreed to at the Conference.

U.S. Position: The United States joined consensus on this resolution. However, in its Explanation of Position, the U.S. delegate noted that the United States opposes global taxes as a means for financing development, that each country must decide how to raise funds for official development assistance (ODA), and that, although important, ODA only represents a small amount of the overall resources available for development. Finally, the United States reaffirmed that, while it had exceeded its pledge to increase ODA by 50 percent over 2000 levels by 2006, it does not accept international aid targets based on percentages of donor GNP. The United States believes that aid should be increased to the developing countries making a demonstrated commitment to govern justly, invest in their people, and promote enterprise and entrepreneurship.

12. Preventing and Combating Corrupt Practices and Transfer of Assets of Illicit Origin and Returning Such Assets to the Countries of Origin

A/Res/59/242

December 22

Condemns corruption in all its forms, including bribery, money-laundering, and transfer of assets of illicit origin. Welcomes the efforts of member states that have enacted laws in the fight against corruption in all its forms. Encourages all governments to prevent, combat, and penalize corruption. Further encourages regional cooperation in the efforts to prevent and combat corrupt practices and the transfer of assets of illicit origin. Calls for further international cooperation through the United Nations and reiterates its request to the international community to provide technical assistance to support national efforts aimed at preventing and combating corrupt practices,

Urges all member states to abide by the principles of proper management of public affairs and public property, fairness, responsibility, and equality. Calls upon the private sector to remain fully engaged in the fight against corruption. Emphasizes the need to continue to promote corporate responsibility and accountability. Encourages all member states to require financial institutions to properly implement comprehensive due diligence and vigilance programs.

Background: Members of the Group of 77 and China introduced this resolution into the Second Committee. The United States agrees that corruption at all levels is a serious barrier to development and is committed to the positive language of this resolution, which calls for further international cooperation and remaining fully engaged in the fight against corruption.

U.S. Position: The United States joined consensus on this resolution in agreement that good governance is essential to sustainable development. This resolution represents a very positive step forward in focusing attention on the importance of combating corruption.

13. Integration of the Economies in Transition into the World Economy

A/Res/59/243

December 22

Welcoming the progress made in countries with economies in transition towards market-oriented reforms and achieving macroeconomic and financial stability and economic growth, among other things, through sound macroeconomic policies, good governance, and rule of law, and noting the need to sustain these positive trends, welcomes the measures taken by the organizations of the UN system to implement General Assembly resolutions on the integration of the economies in transition into the world economy.

Calls upon the UN system, including the regional commissions, and invites the Bretton Woods institutions, in collaboration with relevant non-UN

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

multilateral and regional institutions, to continue to conduct analytical activities and provide policy advice and targeted and substantial technical assistance to the governments of the countries with economies in transition aimed at strengthening the social, legal, and political framework for completing market-oriented reforms, supporting national development priorities with a view to sustaining the positive trends, and reversing any declines in the economic and social development of those countries.

Taking into account, among other things, the relevant provisions of the Monterrey Consensus of the International Conference of Financing for Development and the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, stresses the need to focus international assistance to countries with economies in transition facing particular difficulties in socio-economic development; implementing market-oriented reforms; and meeting internationally agreed development goals, including those contained in the UN Millennium Declaration. Welcomes efforts made by countries with economies in transition to improve governance and institutional capabilities in order to use aid more effectively.

Welcomes the efforts made by countries with economies in transition implementing policies that promote sustained economic growth and sustainable development, including, among other things, by promoting competition, regulatory reform, respect for property rights, and expeditious contract enforcement; and calls on the UN system to highlight the success models as good practices.

Background: This resolution previously focused on actions the international community could take to help transition economies, such as ensuring favorable conditions for market access of exports, encouraging foreign direct investment, and recognizing the need for capacity building.

U.S. Position: In this resolution, the United States gained references to good governance and rule of law and a more detailed description of market oriented policies countries should pursue. This resolution also avoided calling for international assistance in general to help the slower transitioning economies. The United States succeeded in linking the effectiveness of aid to improved governance and accountability. Because of these positive changes, the United States was able to join consensus.

14. Situation of Human Rights in Myanmar (Burma)

A/Res/59/263

December 23

Expresses its grave concern at the ongoing systematic violation of human rights of the people of Burma; the events of May 30, 2003, and the continuing detention and house arrest of Aung San Suu Kyi and members of the National League for Democracy; and the Burmese authorities' failure to implement recommendations contained in previous General Assembly and Commission on Human Rights (CHR) resolutions or to permit the Special

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

Envoy of the Secretary-General for Burma to visit for over six months or the Special Rapporteur of the CHR on the situation of human rights in Burma to visit for almost 12 months, despite repeated requests.

Calls upon the Government of Burma to end the systematic violations of human rights in Burma to ensure full respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms, and to end impunity; ensure that the National Convention is fully inclusive of all political parties and representatives and all major ethnic nationalities not represented by a political party; restore democracy and respect the results of the 1990 elections, including by releasing immediately and unconditionally the leadership of the National League for Democracy and all detained or imprisoned political prisoners; and initiate a full and independent inquiry into the Depayin incident of May 30, 2003. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide his good offices, assist his Special Envoy and the Special Rapporteur to discharge their mandate, and to report to the General Assembly and the CHR at their next session on progress made in implementation of the resolution.

Background: In 2003, the General Assembly adopted a resolution condemning Burma's human rights record. The resolution was adopted without a vote, although Burma disassociated from consensus. Burma's human rights record worsened during 2004. Burmese authorities have not allowed the Special Rapporteur to visit the country since November 2003, and the Envoy has not visited Burma since March 2004.

U.S. Position: The United States cosponsored this European Union resolution. The United States continues to call on the junta to release Aung San Suu Kyi, U Tin Oo, Hkun Htun Oo, and all political prisoners immediately and unconditionally; allow the National League for Democracy to re-open its offices nation-wide; engage the democratic opposition in a meaningful dialogue leading to genuine national reconciliation and the establishment of democracy; and to respect and ensure the free exercise of the fundamental human rights of the people of Burma. The National League for Democracy and ethnic political parties were not invited to participate in the National Convention, reconvened by the junta on February 17 for the purpose of drafting a new Constitution. Without their full participation, the Convention lacks the legitimacy to draw up a Constitution that is truly democratic and representative of the will of the Burmese people.

15. Review of the Implementation of Resolution 48/218B and 52/244

A/Res/59/272

December 23

Requests the Secretary-General to ensure that Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) reports submitted to the General Assembly contain the titles and brief summaries of all OIOS reports issued during the year or reporting period, and that original versions of OIOS reports not submitted to the General Assembly are, upon request, made available to any member state.

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

Also decides that when access to a report would be inappropriate for reasons of confidentiality or the risk of violating the due process rights of individuals involved in OIOS investigations, the report may be modified, or withheld in extraordinary circumstances. Further decides that OIOS reports shall be submitted directly to the General Assembly as submitted by OIOS and that the Secretary-General may submit comments in a separate report. Regrets that despite previous information provided by the Secretary-General on the establishment of accountability mechanisms, including the accountability panel, such mechanisms are not in place. Concur with the OIOS annual report that a high-level follow-up mechanism under the authority of the Secretary-General should be established to feed OIOS findings and recommendations, as well as relevant findings of the Joint Inspection Unit and the Board of Auditors, into the executive management processes, and requests the Secretary-General to establish this follow-up mechanism as soon as possible and to report to the General Assembly on the results achieved.

Background: The OIOS was established in 1994 to provide internal oversight to the United Nations and to promote stronger stewardship of resources, accountability, transparency, and performance.

U.S. Position: This resolution was a U.S. initiative. The United States was concerned that the United Nations had not made available to member states 55 OIOS audits on various aspects of the Oil-for-Food program conducted over the life of the program. During the 59th General Assembly, the United States made other proposals to strengthen OIOS, including giving OIOS budgetary independence from the offices that it audits and extending the nonrenewable term of the Under Secretary-General for Internal Oversight from the current five to seven years.

16. Program Budget for the Biennium 2004–2005

A/Res/59/277

December 23

Resolves that for the biennium 2004–2005, the amount of \$3.18 billion appropriated in Resolutions 58/271 A and 58/295 shall be adjusted by an increase of \$428 million. Resolves that for the biennium 2004–2005, the estimates of income of \$415 million approved in Resolutions 58/271 B and 58/295 shall be increased by \$28 million. Budget appropriations totaling \$2.02 billion shall be financed in accordance with the UN Financial Regulations and Rules.

Background: This resolution brought the total biennial budget for 2004–2005, including inflation, currency fluctuations, additional mandates, and unforeseen expenses, to \$3.608 billion. The resolution included an appropriation of \$54 million to establish a new Department of Safety and Security in the United Nations, in keeping with the Secretary-General's November 1 recommendation to the Fifth Committee for an overhaul of the UN's security structure and a new directorate of security.

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

U.S. Position: This resolution was adopted unanimously. The United States supported the Secretary-General's recommendation for a new directorate of security.

COMPARISON WITH U.S. VOTES

The tables that follow summarize UN member state performance at the 59th UNGA in comparison with the United States on the 10 important votes. In these tables, “Identical Votes” is the total number of times the United States and the listed state both voted Yes or No on these issues. “Opposite Votes” is the total number of times the United States voted Yes and the listed state No, or the United States voted No and the listed state Yes. “Abstentions” and “Absences” are totals for the country being compared on these 10 votes. “Voting Coincidence (Votes Only)” is calculated by dividing the number of identical votes by the total of identical and opposite votes. The column headed “Voting Coincidence (Including Consensus)” presents the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including the 16 important consensus resolutions as identical votes. The extent of participation was also factored in. (See the second paragraph in this section.)

The first table lists all UN member states in alphabetical order. The second lists them by number of identical votes in descending order; those states with the same number of identical votes are further ranked by the number of opposite votes in ascending order. Countries with the same number of both identical votes and opposite votes are listed alphabetically. Subsequent tables are comparisons of UN members by regional and other groupings to which they belong, again ranked in descending order of identical votes.

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

All Countries (Alphabetical)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Afghanistan	2	6	0	2	69.6%	25.0%
Albania	4	3	3	0	86.2%	57.1%
Algeria	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Andorra	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Angola	2	4	1	3	77.9%	33.3%
Antigua-Barbuda	2	3	2	3	84.2%	40.0%
Argentina	3	5	2	0	79.2%	37.5%
Armenia	3	6	1	0	75.8%	33.3%
Australia	7	2	1	0	91.9%	77.8%
Austria	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Azerbaijan	2	8	0	0	67.7%	20.0%
Bahamas	2	5	2	1	77.2%	28.6%
Bahrain	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Bangladesh	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Barbados	2	6	1	1	74.0%	25.0%
Belarus	1	8	1	0	66.6%	11.1%
Belgium	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Belize	3	7	0	0	72.5%	30.0%
Benin	2	7	1	0	70.8%	22.2%
Bhutan	1	5	2	2	72.1%	16.7%
Bolivia	4	6	0	0	76.9%	40.0%
Bosnia/Herzegovina	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Botswana	2	7	1	0	69.1%	22.2%
Brazil	2	6	2	0	75.0%	25.0%
Brunei Darussalam	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Bulgaria	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Burkina Faso	2	7	1	0	71.4%	22.2%
Burundi	2	4	4	0	80.4%	33.3%
Cambodia	2	7	1	0	71.0%	22.2%
Cameroon	2	4	4	0	81.4%	33.3%
Canada	6	2	2	0	91.5%	75.0%
Cape Verde	2	6	1	1	72.3%	25.0%
Central African Rep.	2	6	1	1	71.6%	25.0%
Chad	2	1	0	7	86.2%	66.7%
Chile	4	6	0	0	76.6%	40.0%
China	1	8	1	0	67.5%	11.1%
Colombia	2	6	2	0	75.0%	25.0%
Comoros	2	6	0	2	72.3%	25.0%
Congo	0	6	0	4	62.4%	0.0%
Costa Rica	3	4	3	0	82.2%	42.9%
Cote d'Ivoire	2	6	2	0	73.4%	25.0%

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Croatia	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Cuba	1	8	1	0	67.1%	11.1%
Cyprus	4	5	1	0	80.0%	44.4%
Czech Republic	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
DPR of Korea	1	7	1	1	67.7%	12.5%
Dem. Rep. Congo	2	3	0	5	74.9%	40.0%
Denmark	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Djibouti	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Dominica	2	5	1	2	77.0%	28.6%
Dominican Republic	2	3	5	0	85.5%	40.0%
Ecuador	2	6	2	0	74.8%	25.0%
Egypt	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
El Salvador	4	4	1	1	83.2%	50.0%
Equatorial Guinea	2	3	2	3	83.0%	40.0%
Eritrea	2	6	1	1	73.4%	25.0%
Estonia	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Ethiopia	2	6	2	0	73.0%	25.0%
Fiji	2	4	3	1	80.7%	33.3%
Finland	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
France	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Gabon	2	7	0	1	66.8%	22.2%
Gambia	2	6	0	2	66.9%	25.0%
Georgia	3	3	3	1	85.4%	50.0%
Germany	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Ghana	2	7	1	0	71.4%	22.2%
Greece	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Grenada	5	3	1	1	87.0%	62.5%
Guatemala	3	3	4	0	86.4%	50.0%
Guinea	2	6	0	2	65.6%	25.0%
Guinea-Bissau	2	6	1	1	72.3%	25.0%
Guyana	2	7	1	0	71.6%	22.2%
Haiti	3	3	3	1	84.6%	50.0%
Honduras	2	3	4	1	84.5%	40.0%
Hungary	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Iceland	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
India	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Indonesia	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Iran	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Iraq	2	6	1	1	68.5%	25.0%
Ireland	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Israel	8	0	2	0	100.0%	100.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Italy	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Jamaica	2	6	2	0	73.8%	25.0%
Japan	4	2	4	0	90.9%	66.7%
Jordan	3	7	0	0	72.7%	30.0%
Kazakhstan	2	7	1	0	70.1%	22.2%
Kenya	2	4	4	0	81.8%	33.3%
Kiribati	1	1	0	8	57.5%	50.0%
Kuwait	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Kyrgyzstan	2	5	1	2	75.8%	28.6%
Laos	1	7	2	0	68.0%	12.5%
Latvia	4	3	3	0	86.6%	57.1%
Lebanon	2	8	0	0	67.9%	20.0%
Lesotho	2	7	1	0	70.5%	22.2%
Liberia	2	5	2	1	75.8%	28.6%
Libya	1	8	1	0	67.5%	11.1%
Liechtenstein	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Lithuania	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Luxembourg	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Madagascar	2	7	1	0	71.2%	22.2%
Malawi	3	3	0	4	81.0%	50.0%
Malaysia	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Maldives	2	8	0	0	67.7%	20.0%
Mali	2	7	0	1	70.5%	22.2%
Malta	4	5	1	0	79.9%	44.4%
Marshall Islands	8	2	0	0	92.0%	80.0%
Mauritania	2	6	0	2	62.9%	25.0%
Mauritius	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Mexico	4	5	1	0	80.0%	44.4%
Micronesia	7	2	1	0	90.9%	77.8%
Monaco	4	3	3	0	85.7%	57.1%
Mongolia	3	3	1	3	85.8%	50.0%
Morocco	2	6	0	2	74.2%	25.0%
Mozambique	2	7	1	0	68.1%	22.2%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	8	1	0	67.8%	11.1%
Namibia	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Nauru	6	3	1	0	86.9%	66.7%
Nepal	2	7	1	0	71.6%	22.2%
Netherlands	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
New Zealand	4	2	4	0	90.9%	66.7%
Nicaragua	4	2	3	1	90.7%	66.7%
Niger	2	7	0	1	67.1%	22.2%

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Nigeria	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Norway	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Oman	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Pakistan	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Palau	10	0	0	0	100.0%	100.0%
Panama	4	5	1	0	79.9%	44.4%
Papua New Guinea	3	3	4	0	85.2%	50.0%
Paraguay	4	6	0	0	76.4%	40.0%
Peru	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Philippines	2	6	2	0	74.8%	25.0%
Poland	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Portugal	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Qatar	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Republic of Korea	3	2	5	0	90.4%	60.0%
Republic of Moldova	4	3	3	0	86.6%	57.1%
Romania	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Russia	2	5	3	0	78.3%	28.6%
Rwanda	2	4	1	3	77.0%	33.3%
St. Kitts and Nevis	0	2	0	8	41.6%	0.0%
Saint Lucia	2	7	1	0	70.8%	22.2%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	3	6	1	0	75.3%	33.3%
Samoa	3	3	3	1	85.0%	50.0%
San Marino	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Sao Tome/Principe	2	4	1	3	78.1%	33.3%
Saudi Arabia	1	8	1	0	67.3%	11.1%
Senegal	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Serbia/Montenegro	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Seychelles	2	4	0	4	74.4%	33.3%
Sierra Leone	2	7	1	0	71.4%	22.2%
Singapore	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Slovak Republic	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Slovenia	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Solomon Islands	3	3	4	0	84.5%	50.0%
Somalia	3	7	0	0	72.1%	30.0%
South Africa	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Spain	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Sri Lanka	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Sudan	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Suriname	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Swaziland	2	3	1	4	81.7%	40.0%
Sweden	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Switzerland	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Syria	1	8	1	0	66.6%	11.1%
Tajikistan	2	7	0	1	66.8%	22.2%
Thailand	2	4	4	0	81.8%	33.3%
TFYR Macedonia	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Timor-Leste	4	3	0	3	86.3%	57.1%
Togo	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Tonga	0	3	3	4	78.6%	0.0%
Trinidad and Tobago	2	6	1	1	73.8%	25.0%
Tunisia	2	8	0	0	68.4%	20.0%
Turkey	2	6	0	2	74.0%	25.0%
Turkmenistan	1	7	1	1	65.2%	12.5%
Tuvalu	3	3	2	2	83.7%	50.0%
Uganda	2	4	4	0	81.1%	33.3%
Ukraine	2	4	3	1	81.5%	33.3%
United Arab Emirates	1	7	2	0	70.4%	12.5%
United Kingdom	4	2	4	0	90.9%	66.7%
UR Tanzania	2	6	1	1	74.4%	25.0%
Uruguay	3	4	3	0	82.3%	42.9%
Uzbekistan	2	4	1	3	77.2%	33.3%
Vanuatu	1	2	3	4	85.9%	33.3%
Venezuela	1	8	1	0	68.0%	11.1%
Vietnam	1	8	1	0	65.3%	11.1%
Yemen	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Zambia	2	7	1	0	71.6%	22.2%
Zimbabwe	1	8	1	0	67.1%	11.1%
Average	2.7	5.1	1.6	0.6	77.5%	35.0%

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Palau	10	0	0	0	100.0%	100.0%
Israel	8	0	2	0	100.0%	100.0%
Marshall Islands	8	2	0	0	92.0%	80.0%
Australia	7	2	1	0	91.9%	77.8%
Micronesia	7	2	1	0	90.9%	77.8%
Canada	6	2	2	0	91.5%	75.0%
Nauru	6	3	1	0	86.9%	66.7%
Grenada	5	3	1	1	87.0%	62.5%
Japan	4	2	4	0	90.9%	66.7%
New Zealand	4	2	4	0	90.9%	66.7%
Nicaragua	4	2	3	1	90.7%	66.7%
United Kingdom	4	2	4	0	90.9%	66.7%
Albania	4	3	3	0	86.2%	57.1%
Andorra	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Austria	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Belgium	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Bosnia/Herzegovina	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Bulgaria	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Croatia	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Czech Republic	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Denmark	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Estonia	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Finland	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
France	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Germany	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Greece	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Hungary	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Iceland	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Ireland	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Italy	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Latvia	4	3	3	0	86.6%	57.1%
Liechtenstein	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Lithuania	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Luxembourg	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Monaco	4	3	3	0	85.7%	57.1%
Netherlands	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Norway	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Peru	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Poland	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Portugal	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Republic of Moldova	4	3	3	0	86.6%	57.1%
Romania	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
San Marino	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Serbia/Montenegro	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Slovak Republic	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Slovenia	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Spain	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Sweden	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Switzerland	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
TFYR Macedonia	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Timor-Leste	4	3	0	3	86.3%	57.1%
El Salvador	4	4	1	1	83.2%	50.0%
Cyprus	4	5	1	0	80.0%	44.4%
Malta	4	5	1	0	79.9%	44.4%
Mexico	4	5	1	0	80.0%	44.4%
Panama	4	5	1	0	79.9%	44.4%
Bolivia	4	6	0	0	76.9%	40.0%
Chile	4	6	0	0	76.6%	40.0%
Paraguay	4	6	0	0	76.4%	40.0%
Republic of Korea	3	2	5	0	90.4%	60.0%
Georgia	3	3	3	1	85.4%	50.0%
Guatemala	3	3	4	0	86.4%	50.0%
Haiti	3	3	3	1	84.6%	50.0%
Malawi	3	3	0	4	81.0%	50.0%
Mongolia	3	3	1	3	85.8%	50.0%
Papua New Guinea	3	3	4	0	85.2%	50.0%
Samoa	3	3	3	1	85.0%	50.0%
Solomon Islands	3	3	4	0	84.5%	50.0%
Tuvalu	3	3	2	2	83.7%	50.0%
Costa Rica	3	4	3	0	82.2%	42.9%
Uruguay	3	4	3	0	82.3%	42.9%
Argentina	3	5	2	0	79.2%	37.5%
Armenia	3	6	1	0	75.8%	33.3%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	3	6	1	0	75.3%	33.3%
Belize	3	7	0	0	72.5%	30.0%
Jordan	3	7	0	0	72.7%	30.0%
Somalia	3	7	0	0	72.1%	30.0%
Chad	2	1	0	7	86.2%	66.7%
Antigua-Barbuda	2	3	2	3	84.2%	40.0%
Dem. Rep. Congo	2	3	0	5	74.9%	40.0%

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Dominican Republic	2	3	5	0	85.5%	40.0%
Equatorial Guinea	2	3	2	3	83.0%	40.0%
Honduras	2	3	4	1	84.5%	40.0%
Swaziland	2	3	1	4	81.7%	40.0%
Angola	2	4	1	3	77.9%	33.3%
Burundi	2	4	4	0	80.4%	33.3%
Cameroon	2	4	4	0	81.4%	33.3%
Fiji	2	4	3	1	80.7%	33.3%
Kenya	2	4	4	0	81.8%	33.3%
Rwanda	2	4	1	3	77.0%	33.3%
Sao Tome/Principe	2	4	1	3	78.1%	33.3%
Seychelles	2	4	0	4	74.4%	33.3%
Thailand	2	4	4	0	81.8%	33.3%
Uganda	2	4	4	0	81.1%	33.3%
Ukraine	2	4	3	1	81.5%	33.3%
Uzbekistan	2	4	1	3	77.2%	33.3%
Bahamas	2	5	2	1	77.2%	28.6%
Dominica	2	5	1	2	77.0%	28.6%
Kyrgyzstan	2	5	1	2	75.8%	28.6%
Liberia	2	5	2	1	75.8%	28.6%
Russia	2	5	3	0	78.3%	28.6%
Afghanistan	2	6	0	2	69.6%	25.0%
Barbados	2	6	1	1	74.0%	25.0%
Brazil	2	6	2	0	75.0%	25.0%
Cape Verde	2	6	1	1	72.3%	25.0%
Central African. Rep.	2	6	1	1	71.6%	25.0%
Colombia	2	6	2	0	75.0%	25.0%
Comoros	2	6	0	2	72.3%	25.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	2	6	2	0	73.4%	25.0%
Ecuador	2	6	2	0	74.8%	25.0%
Eritrea	2	6	1	1	73.4%	25.0%
Ethiopia	2	6	2	0	73.0%	25.0%
Gambia	2	6	0	2	66.9%	25.0%
Guinea	2	6	0	2	65.6%	25.0%
Guinea-Bissau	2	6	1	1	72.3%	25.0%
Iraq	2	6	1	1	68.5%	25.0%
Jamaica	2	6	2	0	73.8%	25.0%
Mauritania	2	6	0	2	62.9%	25.0%
Morocco	2	6	0	2	74.2%	25.0%
Philippines	2	6	2	0	74.8%	25.0%
Trinidad and Tobago	2	6	1	1	73.8%	25.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Turkey	2	6	0	2	74.0%	25.0%
UR Tanzania	2	6	1	1	74.4%	25.0%
Benin	2	7	1	0	70.8%	22.2%
Botswana	2	7	1	0	69.1%	22.2%
Burkina Faso	2	7	1	0	71.4%	22.2%
Cambodia	2	7	1	0	71.0%	22.2%
Gabon	2	7	0	1	66.8%	22.2%
Ghana	2	7	1	0	71.4%	22.2%
Guyana	2	7	1	0	71.6%	22.2%
Kazakhstan	2	7	1	0	70.1%	22.2%
Lesotho	2	7	1	0	70.5%	22.2%
Madagascar	2	7	1	0	71.2%	22.2%
Mali	2	7	0	1	70.5%	22.2%
Mauritius	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Mozambique	2	7	1	0	68.1%	22.2%
Namibia	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Nepal	2	7	1	0	71.6%	22.2%
Niger	2	7	0	1	67.1%	22.2%
Saint Lucia	2	7	1	0	70.8%	22.2%
Sierra Leone	2	7	1	0	71.4%	22.2%
Singapore	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Suriname	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Tajikistan	2	7	0	1	66.8%	22.2%
Zambia	2	7	1	0	71.6%	22.2%
Algeria	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Azerbaijan	2	8	0	0	67.7%	20.0%
Bahrain	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Bangladesh	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Brunei Darussalam	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Djibouti	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Egypt	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
India	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Indonesia	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Iran	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Kuwait	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Lebanon	2	8	0	0	67.9%	20.0%
Malaysia	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Maldives	2	8	0	0	67.7%	20.0%
Nigeria	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Oman	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Pakistan	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Qatar	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Senegal	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
South Africa	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Sri Lanka	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Sudan	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Togo	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Tunisia	2	8	0	0	68.4%	20.0%
Yemen	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Kiribati	1	1	0	8	57.5%	50.0%
Vanuatu	1	2	3	4	85.9%	33.3%
Bhutan	1	5	2	2	72.1%	16.7%
DPR of Korea	1	7	1	1	67.7%	12.5%
Laos	1	7	2	0	68.0%	12.5%
Turkmenistan	1	7	1	1	65.2%	12.5%
United Arab Emirates	1	7	2	0	70.4%	12.5%
Belarus	1	8	1	0	66.6%	11.1%
China	1	8	1	0	67.5%	11.1%
Cuba	1	8	1	0	67.1%	11.1%
Libya	1	8	1	0	67.5%	11.1%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	8	1	0	67.8%	11.1%
Saudi Arabia	1	8	1	0	67.3%	11.1%
Syria	1	8	1	0	66.6%	11.1%
Venezuela	1	8	1	0	68.0%	11.1%
Vietnam	1	8	1	0	65.3%	11.1%
Zimbabwe	1	8	1	0	67.1%	11.1%
St. Kitts and Nevis	0	2	0	8	41.6%	0.0%
Tonga	0	3	3	4	78.6%	0.0%
Congo	0	6	0	4	62.4%	0.0%
Average	2.7	5.1	1.6	0.6	77.5%	35.0%

UN REGIONAL GROUPS

The following tables show the voting coincidence percentage with U.S. votes on the 10 important votes.

African Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Malawi	3	3	0	4	81.0%	50.0%
Somalia	3	7	0	0	72.1%	30.0%
Chad	2	1	0	7	86.2%	66.7%
Dem. Rep. Congo	2	3	0	5	74.9%	40.0%
Equatorial Guinea	2	3	2	3	83.0%	40.0%
Swaziland	2	3	1	4	81.7%	40.0%
Angola	2	4	1	3	77.9%	33.3%
Burundi	2	4	4	0	80.4%	33.3%
Cameroon	2	4	4	0	81.4%	33.3%
Kenya	2	4	4	0	81.8%	33.3%
Rwanda	2	4	1	3	77.0%	33.3%
Sao Tome/Principe	2	4	1	3	78.1%	33.3%
Seychelles	2	4	0	4	74.4%	33.3%
Uganda	2	4	4	0	81.1%	33.3%
Liberia	2	5	2	1	75.8%	28.6%
Cape Verde	2	6	1	1	72.3%	25.0%
Central African Rep.	2	6	1	1	71.6%	25.0%
Comoros	2	6	0	2	72.3%	25.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	2	6	2	0	73.4%	25.0%
Eritrea	2	6	1	1	73.4%	25.0%
Ethiopia	2	6	2	0	73.0%	25.0%
Gambia	2	6	0	2	66.9%	25.0%
Guinea	2	6	0	2	65.6%	25.0%
Guinea-Bissau	2	6	1	1	72.3%	25.0%
Mauritania	2	6	0	2	62.9%	25.0%
Morocco	2	6	0	2	74.2%	25.0%
UR Tanzania	2	6	1	1	74.4%	25.0%
Benin	2	7	1	0	70.8%	22.2%
Botswana	2	7	1	0	69.1%	22.2%
Burkina Faso	2	7	1	0	71.4%	22.2%
Gabon	2	7	0	1	66.8%	22.2%
Ghana	2	7	1	0	71.4%	22.2%
Lesotho	2	7	1	0	70.5%	22.2%
Madagascar	2	7	1	0	71.2%	22.2%

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

African Group (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Mali	2	7	0	1	70.5%	22.2%
Mauritius	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Mozambique	2	7	1	0	68.1%	22.2%
Namibia	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Niger	2	7	0	1	67.1%	22.2%
Sierra Leone	2	7	1	0	71.4%	22.2%
Zambia	2	7	1	0	71.6%	22.2%
Algeria	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Djibouti	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Egypt	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Nigeria	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Senegal	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
South Africa	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Sudan	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Togo	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Tunisia	2	8	0	0	68.4%	20.0%
Libya	1	8	1	0	67.5%	11.1%
Zimbabwe	1	8	1	0	67.1%	11.1%
Congo	0	6	0	4	62.4%	0.0%
Average	2.0	6.1	0.9	1.1	72.0%	24.5%

Asian Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Marshall Islands	8	2	0	0	92.0%	80.0%
Micronesia	7	2	1	0	90.9%	77.8%
Nauru	6	3	1	0	86.9%	66.7%
Japan	4	2	4	0	90.9%	66.7%
Timor-Leste	4	3	0	3	86.3%	57.1%
Cyprus	4	5	1	0	80.0%	44.4%
Republic of Korea	3	2	5	0	90.4%	60.0%
Mongolia	3	3	1	3	85.8%	50.0%
Papua New Guinea	3	3	4	0	85.2%	50.0%
Samoa	3	3	3	1	85.0%	50.0%
Solomon Islands	3	3	4	0	84.5%	50.0%
Tuvalu	3	3	2	2	83.7%	50.0%
Jordan	3	7	0	0	72.7%	30.0%
Fiji	2	4	3	1	80.7%	33.3%

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

Asian Group (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Thailand	2	4	4	0	81.8%	33.3%
Uzbekistan	2	4	1	3	77.2%	33.3%
Kyrgyzstan	2	5	1	2	75.8%	28.6%
Afghanistan	2	6	0	2	69.6%	25.0%
Iraq	2	6	1	1	68.5%	25.0%
Philippines	2	6	2	0	74.8%	25.0%
Cambodia	2	7	1	0	71.0%	22.2%
Kazakhstan	2	7	1	0	70.1%	22.2%
Nepal	2	7	1	0	71.6%	22.2%
Singapore	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Tajikistan	2	7	0	1	66.8%	22.2%
Bahrain	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Bangladesh	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Brunei Darussalam	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
India	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Indonesia	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Iran	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Kuwait	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Lebanon	2	8	0	0	67.9%	20.0%
Malaysia	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Maldives	2	8	0	0	67.7%	20.0%
Oman	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Pakistan	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Qatar	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Sri Lanka	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Yemen	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Vanuatu	1	2	3	4	85.9%	33.3%
Bhutan	1	5	2	2	72.1%	16.7%
DPR of Korea	1	7	1	1	67.7%	12.5%
Laos	1	7	2	0	68.0%	12.5%
Turkmenistan	1	7	1	1	65.2%	12.5%
United Arab Emirates	1	7	2	0	70.4%	12.5%
China	1	8	1	0	67.5%	11.1%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	8	1	0	67.8%	11.1%
Saudi Arabia	1	8	1	0	67.3%	11.1%
Syria	1	8	1	0	66.6%	11.1%
Vietnam	1	8	1	0	65.3%	11.1%
Tonga	0	3	3	4	78.6%	0.0%
Average	2.3	5.9	1.2	0.6	73.9%	27.8%

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

Latin American and Caribbean Group (LAC)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Grenada	5	3	1	1	87.0%	62.5%
Nicaragua	4	2	3	1	90.7%	66.7%
Peru	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
El Salvador	4	4	1	1	83.2%	50.0%
Mexico	4	5	1	0	80.0%	44.4%
Panama	4	5	1	0	79.9%	44.4%
Bolivia	4	6	0	0	76.9%	40.0%
Chile	4	6	0	0	76.6%	40.0%
Paraguay	4	6	0	0	76.4%	40.0%
Guatemala	3	3	4	0	86.4%	50.0%
Haiti	3	3	3	1	84.6%	50.0%
Costa Rica	3	4	3	0	82.2%	42.9%
Uruguay	3	4	3	0	82.3%	42.9%
Argentina	3	5	2	0	79.2%	37.5%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	3	6	1	0	75.3%	33.3%
Belize	3	7	0	0	72.5%	30.0%
Antigua-Barbuda	2	3	2	3	84.2%	40.0%
Dominican Republic	2	3	5	0	85.5%	40.0%
Honduras	2	3	4	1	84.5%	40.0%
Bahamas	2	5	2	1	77.2%	28.6%
Dominica	2	5	1	2	77.0%	28.6%
Barbados	2	6	1	1	74.0%	25.0%
Brazil	2	6	2	0	75.0%	25.0%
Colombia	2	6	2	0	75.0%	25.0%
Ecuador	2	6	2	0	74.8%	25.0%
Jamaica	2	6	2	0	73.8%	25.0%
Trinidad and Tobago	2	6	1	1	73.8%	25.0%
Guyana	2	7	1	0	71.6%	22.2%
Saint Lucia	2	7	1	0	70.8%	22.2%
Suriname	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Cuba	1	8	1	0	67.1%	11.1%
Venezuela	1	8	1	0	68.0%	11.1%
St. Kitts and Nevis	0	2	0	8	41.6%	0.0%
Average	2.7	5.0	1.7	0.6	77.8%	34.6%

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

Western European and Others Group (WEOG)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Israel	8	0	2	0	100.0%	100.0%
Australia	7	2	1	0	91.9%	77.8%
Canada	6	2	2	0	91.5%	75.0%
New Zealand	4	2	4	0	90.9%	66.7%
United Kingdom	4	2	4	0	90.9%	66.7%
Andorra	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Austria	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Belgium	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Denmark	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Finland	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
France	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Germany	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Greece	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Iceland	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Ireland	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Italy	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Liechtenstein	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Luxembourg	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Monaco	4	3	3	0	85.7%	57.1%
Netherlands	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Norway	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Portugal	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
San Marino	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Spain	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Sweden	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Switzerland	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Malta	4	5	1	0	79.9%	44.4%
Turkey	2	6	0	2	74.0%	25.0%
Average	4.3	2.9	2.8	0.1	87.2%	59.2%

Eastern European Group (EE)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Albania	4	3	3	0	86.2%	57.1%
Bosnia/Herzegovina	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Bulgaria	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Croatia	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Czech Republic	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Estonia	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

Eastern European Group (EE) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Hungary	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Latvia	4	3	3	0	86.6%	57.1%
Lithuania	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Poland	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Republic of Moldova	4	3	3	0	86.6%	57.1%
Romania	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Serbia/Montenegro	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Slovak Republic	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Slovenia	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
TFYR Macedonia	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Georgia	3	3	3	1	85.4%	50.0%
Armenia	3	6	1	0	75.8%	33.3%
Ukraine	2	4	3	1	81.5%	33.3%
Russia	2	5	3	0	78.3%	28.6%
Azerbaijan	2	8	0	0	67.7%	20.0%
Belarus	1	8	1	0	66.6%	11.1%
Average	3.5	3.7	2.7	0.1	83.7%	48.4%

OTHER GROUPINGS

The following tables show percentage of voting coincidence with U.S. votes for major groups, in rank order by identical votes.

Arab Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Jordan	3	7	0	0	72.7%	30.0%
Somalia	3	7	0	0	72.1%	30.0%
Iraq	2	6	1	1	68.5%	25.0%
Mauritania	2	6	0	2	62.9%	25.0%
Morocco	2	6	0	2	74.2%	25.0%
Algeria	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Bahrain	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Djibouti	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Egypt	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Kuwait	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Lebanon	2	8	0	0	67.9%	20.0%
Oman	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Qatar	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Sudan	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Tunisia	2	8	0	0	68.4%	20.0%
Yemen	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
United Arab Emirates	1	7	2	0	70.4%	12.5%
Libya	1	8	1	0	67.5%	11.1%
Saudi Arabia	1	8	1	0	67.3%	11.1%
Syria	1	8	1	0	66.6%	11.1%
Average	1.9	7.6	0.3	0.3	69.0%	20.1%

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Thailand	2	4	4	0	81.8%	33.3%
Philippines	2	6	2	0	74.8%	25.0%
Cambodia	2	7	1	0	71.0%	22.2%
Singapore	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Brunei Darussalam	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Indonesia	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Malaysia	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Laos	1	7	2	0	68.0%	12.5%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	8	1	0	67.8%	11.1%

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Vietnam	1	8	1	0	65.3%	11.1%
Average	1.7	7.1	1.2	0.0	70.7%	19.3%

European Union (EU)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
United Kingdom	4	2	4	0	90.9%	66.7%
Austria	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Belgium	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Czech Republic	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Denmark	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Estonia	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Finland	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
France	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Germany	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Greece	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Hungary	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Ireland	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Italy	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Latvia	4	3	3	0	86.6%	57.1%
Lithuania	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Luxembourg	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Netherlands	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Poland	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Portugal	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Slovak Republic	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Slovenia	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Spain	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Sweden	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Cyprus	4	5	1	0	80.0%	44.4%
Malta	4	5	1	0	79.9%	44.4%
Average	4.0	3.1	2.9	0.0	86.4%	56.2%

Islamic Conference (OIC)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Albania	4	3	3	0	86.2%	57.1%

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

Islamic Conference (OIC) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Jordan	3	7	0	0	72.7%	30.0%
Somalia	3	7	0	0	72.1%	30.0%
Chad	2	1	0	7	86.2%	66.7%
Cameroon	2	4	4	0	81.4%	33.3%
Uganda	2	4	4	0	81.1%	33.3%
Uzbekistan	2	4	1	3	77.2%	33.3%
Kyrgyzstan	2	5	1	2	75.8%	28.6%
Afghanistan	2	6	0	2	69.6%	25.0%
Comoros	2	6	0	2	72.3%	25.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	2	6	2	0	73.4%	25.0%
Gambia	2	6	0	2	66.9%	25.0%
Guinea	2	6	0	2	65.6%	25.0%
Guinea-Bissau	2	6	1	1	72.3%	25.0%
Iraq	2	6	1	1	68.5%	25.0%
Mauritania	2	6	0	2	62.9%	25.0%
Morocco	2	6	0	2	74.2%	25.0%
Turkey	2	6	0	2	74.0%	25.0%
Benin	2	7	1	0	70.8%	22.2%
Burkina Faso	2	7	1	0	71.4%	22.2%
Gabon	2	7	0	1	66.8%	22.2%
Guyana	2	7	1	0	71.6%	22.2%
Kazakhstan	2	7	1	0	70.1%	22.2%
Mali	2	7	0	1	70.5%	22.2%
Mozambique	2	7	1	0	68.1%	22.2%
Niger	2	7	0	1	67.1%	22.2%
Sierra Leone	2	7	1	0	71.4%	22.2%
Suriname	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Tajikistan	2	7	0	1	66.8%	22.2%
Algeria	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Azerbaijan	2	8	0	0	67.7%	20.0%
Bahrain	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Bangladesh	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Brunei Darussalam	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Djibouti	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Egypt	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Indonesia	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Iran	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Kuwait	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Lebanon	2	8	0	0	67.9%	20.0%
Malaysia	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

Islamic Conference (OIC) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Maldives	2	8	0	0	67.7%	20.0%
Nigeria	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Oman	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Pakistan	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Qatar	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Senegal	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Sudan	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Togo	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Tunisia	2	8	0	0	68.4%	20.0%
Yemen	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Turkmenistan	1	7	1	1	65.2%	12.5%
United Arab Emirates	1	7	2	0	70.4%	12.5%
Libya	1	8	1	0	67.5%	11.1%
Saudi Arabia	1	8	1	0	67.3%	11.1%
Syria	1	8	1	0	66.6%	11.1%
Average	2.0	6.9	0.5	0.6	70.3%	22.3%

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Grenada	5	3	1	1	87.0%	62.5%
Nicaragua	4	2	3	1	90.7%	66.7%
Peru	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Cyprus	4	5	1	0	80.0%	44.4%
Malta	4	5	1	0	79.9%	44.4%
Panama	4	5	1	0	79.9%	44.4%
Bolivia	4	6	0	0	76.9%	40.0%
Chile	4	6	0	0	76.6%	40.0%
Guatemala	3	3	4	0	86.4%	50.0%
Malawi	3	3	0	4	81.0%	50.0%
Mongolia	3	3	1	3	85.8%	50.0%
Papua New Guinea	3	3	4	0	85.2%	50.0%
Belize	3	7	0	0	72.5%	30.0%
Jordan	3	7	0	0	72.7%	30.0%
Somalia	3	7	0	0	72.1%	30.0%
Chad	2	1	0	7	86.2%	66.7%
Dem. Rep. Congo	2	3	0	5	74.9%	40.0%
Dominican Republic	2	3	5	0	85.5%	40.0%
Equatorial Guinea	2	3	2	3	83.0%	40.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Honduras	2	3	4	1	84.5%	40.0%
Swaziland	2	3	1	4	81.7%	40.0%
Angola	2	4	1	3	77.9%	33.3%
Burundi	2	4	4	0	80.4%	33.3%
Cameroon	2	4	4	0	81.4%	33.3%
Kenya	2	4	4	0	81.8%	33.3%
Rwanda	2	4	1	3	77.0%	33.3%
Sao Tome/Principe	2	4	1	3	78.1%	33.3%
Seychelles	2	4	0	4	74.4%	33.3%
Thailand	2	4	4	0	81.8%	33.3%
Uganda	2	4	4	0	81.1%	33.3%
Uzbekistan	2	4	1	3	77.2%	33.3%
Bahamas	2	5	2	1	77.2%	28.6%
Liberia	2	5	2	1	75.8%	28.6%
Afghanistan	2	6	0	2	69.6%	25.0%
Barbados	2	6	1	1	74.0%	25.0%
Cape Verde	2	6	1	1	72.3%	25.0%
Central African Rep.	2	6	1	1	71.6%	25.0%
Colombia	2	6	2	0	75.0%	25.0%
Comoros	2	6	0	2	72.3%	25.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	2	6	2	0	73.4%	25.0%
Ecuador	2	6	2	0	74.8%	25.0%
Eritrea	2	6	1	1	73.4%	25.0%
Ethiopia	2	6	2	0	73.0%	25.0%
Gambia	2	6	0	2	66.9%	25.0%
Guinea	2	6	0	2	65.6%	25.0%
Guinea-Bissau	2	6	1	1	72.3%	25.0%
Iraq	2	6	1	1	68.5%	25.0%
Jamaica	2	6	2	0	73.8%	25.0%
Mauritania	2	6	0	2	62.9%	25.0%
Morocco	2	6	0	2	74.2%	25.0%
Philippines	2	6	2	0	74.8%	25.0%
Trinidad and Tobago	2	6	1	1	73.8%	25.0%
UR Tanzania	2	6	1	1	74.4%	25.0%
Benin	2	7	1	0	70.8%	22.2%
Botswana	2	7	1	0	69.1%	22.2%
Burkina Faso	2	7	1	0	71.4%	22.2%
Cambodia	2	7	1	0	71.0%	22.2%
Gabon	2	7	0	1	66.8%	22.2%
Ghana	2	7	1	0	71.4%	22.2%

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Guyana	2	7	1	0	71.6%	22.2%
Lesotho	2	7	1	0	70.5%	22.2%
Madagascar	2	7	1	0	71.2%	22.2%
Mali	2	7	0	1	70.5%	22.2%
Mauritius	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Mozambique	2	7	1	0	68.1%	22.2%
Namibia	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Nepal	2	7	1	0	71.6%	22.2%
Niger	2	7	0	1	67.1%	22.2%
Saint Lucia	2	7	1	0	70.8%	22.2%
Sierra Leone	2	7	1	0	71.4%	22.2%
Singapore	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Suriname	2	7	1	0	71.8%	22.2%
Zambia	2	7	1	0	71.6%	22.2%
Algeria	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Bahrain	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Bangladesh	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Brunei Darussalam	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Djibouti	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Egypt	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
India	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Indonesia	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Iran	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Kuwait	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Lebanon	2	8	0	0	67.9%	20.0%
Malaysia	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Maldives	2	8	0	0	67.7%	20.0%
Nigeria	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Oman	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Pakistan	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Qatar	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Senegal	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
South Africa	2	8	0	0	68.8%	20.0%
Sri Lanka	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Sudan	2	8	0	0	69.0%	20.0%
Togo	2	8	0	0	68.6%	20.0%
Tunisia	2	8	0	0	68.4%	20.0%
Yemen	2	8	0	0	69.2%	20.0%
Vanuatu	1	2	3	4	85.9%	33.3%

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Bhutan	1	5	2	2	72.1%	16.7%
DPR of Korea	1	7	1	1	67.7%	12.5%
Laos	1	7	2	0	68.0%	12.5%
Turkmenistan	1	7	1	1	65.2%	12.5%
United Arab Emirates	1	7	2	0	70.4%	12.5%
Belarus	1	8	1	0	66.6%	11.1%
Cuba	1	8	1	0	67.1%	11.1%
Libya	1	8	1	0	67.5%	11.1%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	8	1	0	67.8%	11.1%
Saudi Arabia	1	8	1	0	67.3%	11.1%
Syria	1	8	1	0	66.6%	11.1%
Venezuela	1	8	1	0	68.0%	11.1%
Vietnam	1	8	1	0	65.3%	11.1%
Zimbabwe	1	8	1	0	67.1%	11.1%
Congo	0	6	0	4	62.4%	0.0%
Average	2.1	6.2	1.0	0.7	72.7%	25.0%

Nordic Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Denmark	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Finland	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Iceland	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Norway	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Sweden	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Average	4.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	86.9%	57.1%

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Canada	6	2	2	0	91.5%	75.0%
United Kingdom	4	2	4	0	90.9%	66.7%
Belgium	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Bulgaria	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Czech Republic	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Denmark	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Estonia	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
France	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Germany	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Greece	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Hungary	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Iceland	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Italy	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Latvia	4	3	3	0	86.6%	57.1%
Lithuania	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Luxembourg	4	3	3	0	86.8%	57.1%
Netherlands	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Norway	4	3	3	0	86.9%	57.1%
Poland	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Portugal	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Romania	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Slovak Republic	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Slovenia	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Spain	4	3	3	0	87.0%	57.1%
Turkey	2	6	0	2	74.0%	25.0%
Average	4.0	3.0	2.9	0.1	86.7%	56.8%

COMPARISON OF IMPORTANT AND OVERALL VOTES

The following table shows the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States in 2004 for both important votes and all Plenary votes, in a side-by-side comparison.

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Afghanistan.....	2	6	25.0%	5	52	8.8%
Albania	4	3	57.1%	29	29	50.0%
Algeria	2	8	20.0%	7	63	10.0%
Andorra.....	4	3	57.1%	29	40	42.0%
Angola	2	4	33.3%	9	43	17.3%
Antigua-Barbuda	2	3	40.0%	6	50	10.7%
Argentina	3	5	37.5%	17	51	25.0%
Armenia	3	6	33.3%	18	49	26.9%
Australia	7	2	77.8%	34	26	56.7%
Austria	4	3	57.1%	29	39	42.6%
Azerbaijan.....	2	8	20.0%	8	56	12.5%
Bahamas	2	5	28.6%	7	57	10.9%
Bahrain	2	8	20.0%	6	62	8.8%
Bangladesh	2	8	20.0%	6	64	8.6%
Barbados	2	6	25.0%	6	57	9.5%
Belarus.....	1	8	11.1%	5	57	8.1%
Belgium	4	3	57.1%	29	37	43.9%
Belize.....	3	7	30.0%	8	61	11.6%
Benin	2	7	22.2%	10	57	14.9%
Bhutan	1	5	16.7%	3	39	7.1%
Bolivia	4	6	40.0%	18	60	23.1%
Bosnia/Herzegovina.....	4	3	57.1%	29	39	42.6%
Botswana	2	7	22.2%	8	56	12.5%
Brazil	2	6	25.0%	10	57	14.9%
Brunei Darussalam	2	8	20.0%	6	63	8.7%
Bulgaria	4	3	57.1%	30	38	44.1%
Burkina Faso.....	2	7	22.2%	10	60	14.3%
Burundi.....	2	4	33.3%	6	55	9.8%
Cambodia.....	2	7	22.2%	8	60	11.8%
Cameroon	2	4	33.3%	12	44	21.4%
Canada	6	2	75.0%	32	32	50.0%
Cape Verde	2	6	25.0%	5	57	8.1%
Central African Rep.....	2	6	25.0%	10	52	16.1%
Chad.....	2	1	66.7%	5	17	22.7%
Chile	4	6	40.0%	20	54	27.0%
China	1	8	11.1%	6	62	8.8%

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Colombia	2	6	25.0%	7	59	10.6%
Comoros	2	6	25.0%	5	57	8.1%
Congo	0	6	0.0%	3	43	6.5%
Costa Rica.....	3	4	42.9%	15	56	21.1%
Cote d'Ivoire.....	2	6	25.0%	11	50	18.0%
Croatia	4	3	57.1%	29	39	42.6%
Cuba.....	1	8	11.1%	5	63	7.4%
Cyprus	4	5	44.4%	29	43	40.3%
Czech Republic.....	4	3	57.1%	30	37	44.8%
Dem. Rep. of the Congo ...	2	3	40.0%	9	24	27.3%
DPR of Korea	1	7	12.5%	2	59	3.3%
Denmark	4	3	57.1%	31	38	44.9%
Djibouti.....	2	8	20.0%	9	62	12.7%
Dominica	2	5	28.6%	6	57	9.5%
Dominican Republic	2	3	40.0%	16	52	23.5%
Ecuador.....	2	6	25.0%	11	59	15.7%
Egypt	2	8	20.0%	6	65	8.5%
El Salvador	4	4	50.0%	18	56	24.3%
Equatorial Guinea	2	3	40.0%	11	43	20.4%
Eritrea	2	6	25.0%	7	59	10.6%
Estonia	4	3	57.1%	27	38	41.5%
Ethiopia	2	6	25.0%	8	50	13.8%
Fiji	2	4	33.3%	12	53	18.5%
Finland.....	4	3	57.1%	30	39	43.5%
France	4	3	57.1%	33	28	54.1%
Gabon	2	7	22.2%	7	51	12.1%
Gambia	2	6	25.0%	6	44	12.0%
Georgia	3	3	50.0%	22	38	36.7%
Germany	4	3	57.1%	30	37	44.8%
Ghana.....	2	7	22.2%	10	59	14.5%
Greece.....	4	3	57.1%	30	39	43.5%
Grenada.....	5	3	62.5%	19	46	29.2%
Guatemala.....	3	3	50.0%	17	54	23.9%
Guinea	2	6	25.0%	8	38	17.4%
Guinea-Bissau.....	2	6	25.0%	14	52	21.2%
Guyana.....	2	7	22.2%	9	60	13.0%
Haiti	3	3	50.0%	8	36	18.2%
Honduras.....	2	3	40.0%	14	45	23.7%
Hungary	4	3	57.1%	29	38	43.3%
Iceland	4	3	57.1%	30	36	45.5%
India.....	2	8	20.0%	13	52	20.0%
Indonesia.....	2	8	20.0%	6	66	8.3%
Iran.....	2	8	20.0%	6	65	8.5%

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Iraq.....	2	6	25.0%	3	51	5.6%
Ireland.....	4	3	57.1%	28	40	41.2%
Israel	8	0	100.0%	55	4	93.2%
Italy.....	4	3	57.1%	30	39	43.5%
Jamaica	2	6	25.0%	8	56	12.5%
Japan.....	4	2	66.7%	27	36	42.9%
Jordan	3	7	30.0%	12	63	16.0%
Kazakhstan	2	7	22.2%	7	57	10.9%
Kenya.....	2	4	33.3%	8	56	12.5%
Kiribati.....	1	1	50.0%	1	1	50.0%
Kuwait	2	8	20.0%	7	63	10.0%
Kyrgyzstan.....	2	5	28.6%	8	52	13.3%
Laos	1	7	12.5%	3	57	5.0%
Latvia.....	4	3	57.1%	32	36	47.1%
Lebanon	2	8	20.0%	6	63	8.7%
Lesotho	2	7	22.2%	6	61	9.0%
Liberia	2	5	28.6%	8	51	13.6%
Libya.....	1	8	11.1%	7	65	9.7%
Liechtenstein.....	4	3	57.1%	28	39	41.8%
Lithuania.....	4	3	57.1%	30	39	43.5%
Luxembourg	4	3	57.1%	29	38	43.3%
Madagascar.....	2	7	22.2%	9	62	12.7%
Malawi.....	3	3	50.0%	9	31	22.5%
Malaysia	2	8	20.0%	6	64	8.6%
Maldives	2	8	20.0%	7	62	10.1%
Mali	2	7	22.2%	10	61	14.1%
Malta.....	4	5	44.4%	28	42	40.0%
Marshall Islands.....	8	2	80.0%	44	28	61.1%
Mauritania.....	2	6	25.0%	3	32	8.6%
Mauritius.....	2	7	22.2%	8	59	11.9%
Mexico.....	4	5	44.4%	17	57	23.0%
Micronesia	7	2	77.8%	46	13	78.0%
Monaco.....	4	3	57.1%	29	33	46.8%
Mongolia.....	3	3	50.0%	10	58	14.7%
Morocco.....	2	6	25.0%	8	62	11.4%
Mozambique.....	2	7	22.2%	6	54	10.0%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	8	11.1%	8	60	11.8%
Namibia	2	7	22.2%	11	62	15.1%
Nauru	6	3	66.7%	21	32	39.6%
Nepal	2	7	22.2%	9	62	12.7%
Netherlands.....	4	3	57.1%	30	40	42.9%
New Zealand.....	4	2	66.7%	28	41	40.6%
Nicaragua.....	4	2	66.7%	18	51	26.1%

IV – General Assembly Important Votes

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Niger.....	2	7	22.2%	9	52	14.8%
Nigeria.....	2	8	20.0%	11	63	14.9%
Norway.....	4	3	57.1%	29	39	42.6%
Oman.....	2	8	20.0%	7	64	9.9%
Pakistan.....	2	8	20.0%	6	56	9.7%
Palau.....	10	0	100.0%	67	1	98.5%
Panama.....	4	5	44.4%	18	59	23.4%
Papua New Guinea.....	3	3	50.0%	11	40	21.6%
Paraguay.....	4	6	40.0%	18	55	24.7%
Peru.....	4	3	57.1%	18	54	25.0%
Philippines.....	2	6	25.0%	9	60	13.0%
Poland.....	4	3	57.1%	32	38	45.7%
Portugal.....	4	3	57.1%	30	39	43.5%
Qatar.....	2	8	20.0%	7	63	10.0%
Republic of Korea.....	3	2	60.0%	24	37	39.3%
Republic of Moldova.....	4	3	57.1%	22	38	36.7%
Romania.....	4	3	57.1%	30	38	44.1%
Russia.....	2	5	28.6%	11	48	18.6%
Rwanda.....	2	4	33.3%	6	47	11.3%
St. Kitts and Nevis.....	0	2	0.0%	1	5	16.7%
Saint Lucia.....	2	7	22.2%	9	58	13.4%
St. Vincent/Grenadines.....	3	6	33.3%	9	58	13.4%
Samoa.....	3	3	50.0%	17	40	29.8%
San Marino.....	4	3	57.1%	28	40	41.2%
Sao Tome and Principe.....	2	4	33.3%	5	49	9.3%
Saudi Arabia.....	1	8	11.1%	5	64	7.2%
Senegal.....	2	8	20.0%	10	65	13.3%
Serbia/Montenegro.....	4	3	57.1%	29	39	42.6%
Seychelles.....	2	4	33.3%	7	40	14.9%
Sierra Leone.....	2	7	22.2%	8	58	12.1%
Singapore.....	2	7	22.2%	9	57	13.6%
Slovak Republic.....	4	3	57.1%	30	39	43.5%
Slovenia.....	4	3	57.1%	30	38	44.1%
Solomon Islands.....	3	3	50.0%	12	41	22.6%
Somalia.....	3	7	30.0%	6	62	8.8%
South Africa.....	2	8	20.0%	8	62	11.4%
Spain.....	4	3	57.1%	30	36	45.5%
Sri Lanka.....	2	8	20.0%	9	61	12.9%
Sudan.....	2	8	20.0%	10	65	13.3%
Suriname.....	2	7	22.2%	6	63	8.7%
Swaziland.....	2	3	40.0%	7	43	14.0%
Sweden.....	4	3	57.1%	29	39	42.6%
Switzerland.....	4	3	57.1%	28	38	42.4%

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2004

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Syria.....	1	8	11.1%	7	62	10.1%
Tajikistan	2	7	22.2%	6	49	10.9%
Thailand.....	2	4	33.3%	10	57	14.9%
TFYR Macedonia	4	3	57.1%	28	38	42.4%
Timor-Leste	4	3	57.1%	18	55	24.7%
Togo.....	2	8	20.0%	8	64	11.1%
Tonga.....	0	3	0.0%	3	35	7.9%
Trinidad and Tobago	2	6	25.0%	11	57	16.2%
Tunisia	2	8	20.0%	7	63	10.0%
Turkey	2	6	25.0%	24	45	34.8%
Turkmenistan	1	7	12.5%	3	49	5.8%
Tuvalu.....	3	3	50.0%	7	39	15.2%
Uganda.....	2	4	33.3%	5	55	8.3%
Ukraine	2	4	33.3%	18	45	28.6%
United Arab Emirates	1	7	12.5%	5	62	7.5%
United Kingdom	4	2	66.7%	38	29	56.7%
UR Tanzania.....	2	6	25.0%	8	59	11.9%
Uruguay	3	4	42.9%	14	54	20.6%
Uzbekistan	2	4	33.3%	5	35	12.5%
Vanuatu	1	2	33.3%	4	29	12.1%
Venezuela	1	8	11.1%	8	65	11.0%
Vietnam	1	8	11.1%	4	63	6.0%
Yemen	2	8	20.0%	6	64	8.6%
Zambia.....	2	7	22.2%	9	62	12.7%
Zimbabwe.....	1	8	11.1%	5	64	7.2%
Average.....	2.7	5.1	35.0%	14.8	48.8	23.3%